

NO-A178 488


THE COMPUTER AS A TOOL FOR LEARNING THROUGH REFLECTION
(U) BBN LABS INC CAMBRIDGE MA A COLLINS ET AL. MAR 86
BBN-6457 N00014-85-C-0026


1/1

UNCLASSIFIED

F/G 5/10

NL





MICROCOPY RESOLUTION TEST CHART
NATIONAL BUREAU OF STANDARDS-1951-A

BBN Laboratories Incorporated

A Subsidiary of Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc.



AD-A178 408

Report No. 6457


The Computer as a Tool for Learning Through Reflection Technical Report

Allan Collins and John Seely Brown

March 1986

Approved for publication; distribution unlimited

DTIC FILE COPY



87 3 26 055

A179258

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

1a REPORT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified			1b. RESTRICTIVE MARKINGS		
2a. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION AUTHORITY			3. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF REPORT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited		
2b. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING SCHEDULE					
4. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S) BBN Report No. 6457			5. MONITORING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER(S)		
6a. NAME OF PERFORMING ORGANIZATION BBN Laboratories Incorporated		6b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		7a. NAME OF MONITORING ORGANIZATION Personnel and Training Research Programs Office of Naval Research (Code 1142PT)	
6c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 10 Moulton Street Cambridge, MA 02238				7b. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code) 800 North Quincy Street Arlington, VA 22217-5000	
8a. NAME OF FUNDING / SPONSORING ORGANIZATION		8b. OFFICE SYMBOL (If applicable)		9. PROCUREMENT INSTRUMENT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER N00014-85-C-0026	
8c. ADDRESS (City, State, and ZIP Code)		10. SOURCE OF FUNDING NUMBERS			
		PROGRAM ELEMENT NO 61153N		PROJECT NO RR04206	TASK NO RR04206-0A WORK UNIT ACCESSION NO NR 667-540
11. TITLE (Include Security Classification) The Computer as a Tool for Learning Through Reflection (Unclassified)					
12. PERSONAL AUTHOR(S) Allan Collins and John Seely Brown					
13a. TYPE OF REPORT Technical Report		13b. TIME COVERED FROM 1/1/86 TO 12/31/86		14. DATE OF REPORT (Year, Month, Day) 1986, March	
15. PAGE COUNT 20					
16. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTATION In H. Mandl and A. Lesgold (Eds.), <u>Learning issues for intelligent tutoring systems</u> . New York: Springer, in press.					
17. COSATI CODES			18. SUBJECT TERMS (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)		
FIELD	GROUP	SUB-GROUP			
			Education, Teaching, Metacognition, Thinking		
19. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse if necessary and identify by block number)					
With a computational medium it becomes possible, and often easy, to capture directly the processes by which a novice or an expert carries out a complex task. Properly abstracted and structured, this process trace or audit trail can become a useful object of study for students who are trying to learn how to improve their performance on a task. By comparing the details and structure of their own performance with that of more expert performers, they can discover elements that need improving. In a sense, the experts audit trail provides an accessible example of the situated use of general reasoning strategies. Likewise, an audit trail of their own performance provides an object of study from which students can hone important self-monitoring and other metacognitive strategies.					
20. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY OF ABSTRACT <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> UNCLASSIFIED/UNLIMITED <input type="checkbox"/> SAME AS RPT <input type="checkbox"/> DTIC USERS			21. ABSTRACT SECURITY CLASSIFICATION Unclassified		
22a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE INDIVIDUAL Dr. Susan Chipman			22b. TELEPHONE (Include Area Code) 202-696-4318		22c. OFFICE SYMBOL ONR 1142PT

THE COMPUTER AS A TOOL FOR LEARNING THROUGH REFLECTION

Allan Collins
Bolt Beranek and Newman Inc.

John Seely Brown
Xerox, Palo Alto Research Center

In H. Mandl and A. Lesgold (Eds.), Learning issues for intelligent tutoring systems. New York: Springer, in press.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	<input checked="checked" type="checkbox"/>
DTIC TAB	<input type="checkbox"/>
Unannounced	<input type="checkbox"/>
Justification	
By _____	
Distribution/	
Availability Codes	
Distribution/	
Dist _____	
A-1	



THE COMPUTER AS A TOOL FOR LEARNING THROUGH REFLECTION

Allan Collins and John Seely Brown

Introduction

A unique aspect of computers is that they not only represent process, but they also naturally keep track of the actions used to carry out a given task, so that the process and its trace can become an object of study in its own right. One effect of this can be seen vividly in the sciences where computers and computational languages have improved our ability to develop and test process theories of complex natural phenomena. Before powerful computers became readily available as scientific tools, process models were expressed in mathematical languages, such as differential equations -- languages primarily effective in capturing a static snapshot of a process. Computation provided formal languages that are more flexible than mathematics, but just as precise. In part because computation is itself dynamic, it provides an ideal medium for representing and testing richer, more varied, and more detailed theories of process. The use of this medium for process modelling has radically changed the nature of many current theories in both the physical and social sciences. Particularly in the arena of the cognitive sciences, computational techniques have proved to be powerful tools for both experimental and theoretical investigations of mind.

The computational revolution in the sciences has a parallel in education. With a computational medium it becomes possible, and often easy, to capture directly the processes by which a novice or an expert carries out a complex task. Properly abstracted and structured, this process trace or audit trail can become a useful object of study for students who are trying to learn how to improve their performance on a task. By comparing the details and structure of their own performance with that of more expert performers, they can discover elements that need improving. In a sense, the expert's audit trail provides an accessible example of the situated use of general reasoning strategies. Likewise, an audit trail of their own performance provides an object of study from which students can hone important self-monitoring and other metacognitive strategies.

It is because of its ability to record and represent process that we conjecture that the computer can become a powerful tool for learning through reflection, a new form of intellectual bootstrapping. We suggest that the revolution in discovery learning heralded by Logo (Papert, 1980) will not fully materialize, unless there is a way for students to study and explore their own problem-solving efforts. The students' problem-solving processes--their thrashings, false starts and restarts, and partial successes--should not be left implicit. A major value in solving problems occurs when students step back and reflect on how they actually solved the problem and how the particular set of strategies they used were suboptimal and might be improved. Of course, this ideal scenario seldom transpires, in part because students are not really motivated to do so and in part because the current problem-solving medium (i.e., paper and pencil) does not really lend itself to this activity. Our claim here is that the computational medium, properly structured, can provide a powerful, motivating, and as yet untapped tool for focusing the students' attention *directly* on their own thought processes.

This paper reports on several steps in the direction of reflective learning. We will begin by considering a familiar skill, tennis, to illustrate the power and possibilities of reflective media for learning.

Types of Reflection

Let us consider the pedagogical strengths and weaknesses of different ways of representing a tennis swing and the different ways of reflecting on that representation.

Imitation. The tennis coach can imitate a student's swing, highlighting those aspects of the swing that were correct or incorrect, while verbally describing the crucial properties of the swing as it progresses. He can slow the swing down and even stop at critical moments. However, imitations have their limitations as a pedagogical device. For one, there are always distortions in any imitation and the student may focus on them as the relevant features. For another, from a model of a swing, the student cannot be sure how much or exactly how to correct a particular movement. Nor can the student easily engage in a fine-grain analysis of his own swing: he may

miss critical relationships that can only be seen in an abstracted replay or spatial reification.

Replay: Alternatively, the student's swing can be videotaped from different angles and replayed and discussed. The tape can be played as often as the student wants, sped up or slowed down, or stopped in critical places for detailed discussion with the coach. The replay is accurate in its reproduction of the student's behavior. It has high physical fidelity and captures not only the swing itself but also the follow-through, the angling of the ball off the strings of the racquet and so forth, so that the student sees the swing in context. Given split screen technologies, students can even compare themselves to video recordings of experts, and attempt to abstract how to alter their movements to better approximate the important aspects of the experts' swings.

The last notion highlights one of the fundamental limitations of exact replay for use in reflective learning. It is often difficult for students to know what to pay attention to unless a coach points out the important properties as they watch the replay. Indeed, without the student possessing a relevant set of distinctions about the process being observed, he is hard-pressed to meaningfully remember or compare his performance with that of the expert, nor can he readily modify his performance to bring about the desired effects once he knows what they are. However, there are ways to focus the students' attention and to help set the stage for their constructing a useful set of distinctions with which to observe and remember expert performance.

Abstracted replay: Suppose a reflective material is taped to critical points (e.g., the shoulder, elbow, wrist, handle, racquet head), and the motion of these different points recorded during the swing, perhaps from two angles (e.g. the side and the front). Such an abstracted replay attains both accuracy and the unambiguous highlighting of critical features, thus focusing the student's attention on the important parameters of the swing. Abstracted replay thus turns on the notion of "cognitive fidelity" rather than physical fidelity. This is especially crucial when there is too much data for the student to absorb in a full replay or imitation. The highlighting made possible through abstraction conveys information in a way that no verbal explanation can. Of course, if critical features (such as leg positions) are left out, information is lost to the student that is available in the full replay condition.

As with the replay condition, comparison of the student's swing with that of the expert depends on the student either remembering the expert's or using a side-by-side comparison with split screens. If a good abstraction can be constructed, it becomes possible to overlay the student's swing with a trajectory of an expert's swing.

Spatial Reification: The trajectory of the critical points of a swing, say from the side angle or from other angles, can be plotted in a graph. This gives a static representation of the process unfolding in time that can be inspected and analyzed in detail. A spatial reification has many of the same properties as an abstracted replay, but because the dimension of time is now spatially represented, the student can analyze critical relationships over time more easily and can directly refer back to prior parts of the process. For example, the relative height of the racquet head at the beginning, middle, and end of the swing can be easily seen from the side plot. Students can directly compare their plot with a plot of expert performance without relying on memory. But again some critical features may be lost at the expense of others being reified. For example, the timing of the swing is only implicit in the above representation scheme.

As a general principle, multiple representations are helpful. Students should be able to inspect their performance in different ways, so it makes sense to provide them capabilities for seeing full replays, abstracted replays, or spatial reifications. A critical ingredient of the Reciprocal Teaching Method (Palincsar & Brown, 1984) is that the students are able to compare their performance with expert performance in terms of the difficulties they are currently having and the distinctions they currently hold. This suggests showing simpler abstractions of their performance at earlier stages of learning.


Ideally, a coach could diagnose where the student is having difficulty and abstract those elements critical to overcoming the difficulty. For example, a student who is dropping his racquet head might see a replay where the relative position of the wrist and racquet head is highlighted, whereas a student who is bending his elbow too much might see a replay that highlights the positions of the shoulder, elbow, and wrist. This linking of correction to diagnosis is what gives coaching in general and the Reciprocal Teaching Method in particular much of their leverage.

Reflection on the Process of Problem Solving

Two recently developed tutoring systems utilize reifications of the student's problem solving process as a major pedagogical device: *AlgebraLand* and *Geometry Tutor*.

AlgebraLand (Brown, 1985). Students are given algebraic expressions to solve for a particular variable, in Figure 1 they are to solve for N . They manipulate both sides of the equation by selecting an algebraic operator from the menu at the bottom right and a term in the equation in the record window on which the operator is to be applied. In Figure 1, the student first distributes 4 across $(2+N)$, and then divides both sides by 4. In a special search space window, the program automatically forms a tree that represents the various problem-solving steps, halts, and continuations that the student has thus far taken in attempting to solve the problem. If the student becomes stuck, he can return to an earlier node in the solution path by simply pointing at it, and begin a new path that he hopes will lead to a solution. This branching process causes the resulting search space window to be a tree rather than just a single chain of nodes. The record window records each state (i.e., node) the student reached in the current solution path, and the algebraic operation that was used to move from one state to another in that chain.

The tree in the search space window is a reification of the student's problem-solving process. Students can see exactly where they backed up, where they reached the same state twice, where they were getting farther away from a solution, and so on. The structured representation of partial solution paths provides an opportunity to reflect on problem-solving and evaluation strategies in the context of their use, a context that reveals where they worked well and where they may have led the student astray. For example, reflecting on a choice point where the branch (i.e., operator) first chosen proved to be a counter-productive, but where a different branch taken at that choice point (chosen at a later time) proved to be productive, provides grist for considering what features the decision process for that choice point should have focused on. That is, the student should ask himself what properties of the algebraic expression comprising the node could have alerted him to a better strategic choice?



RECORD WINDOW

(8)	$4(2+N)=20$	(PROBLEM)
(9)	$\frac{4(2+N)}{4} = \frac{20}{4}$	(DIVIDE)
(10)	$2+N=5$	(Do-Arithmetic)
(11)	$N+2=5-2$	(SUBTRACT)
(12)	$N=3$	(Do-Arithmetic)
(13)	$N=3$	(SOLVED)

PROBLEMS (done)

Problem Menu

$5B+17=7-3B$
$X/17+21=41$
$\frac{N}{8} = \frac{1}{4}$
$\frac{1}{U} + \frac{1}{V} = \frac{1}{F}$
$17(A-2)=10(A+3)$
$A=P(1+\frac{R}{100})$

Solve for N

$4(2+N)=20$

BASIC OPERATIONS

To Both Sides:	
ADD	SUBTRACT
MULTIPLY	DIVIDE

Do-Arithmetic
Distribute
Expand
Combine-Terms
Cancel-Terms

(undo) (next problem)

Fig. 1 Layout of the screen for Algebraland

Countless learning activities can be constructed around this reified problem space. For example, a student or team can be asked to study another student's (or team's) problem space with the aim of finding a shorter solution path to the problem. Among other things this kind of exercise helps to make explicit that there is no single "right" solution; there are many solutions some of which are shorter and perhaps more elegant than others. Indeed, games can be constructed that turn on this simple idea. Alternatively, using a menu-based annotation editor, such as shown at the bottom left of Figure 1, a student might be asked to annotate the reasons why he made certain choices (see Bundy, 1983), a simple and rewarding exercise if the annotation menu has built into it strategic terms that can be readily selected and joined to the links in the reified problem space (personal communication, Carolyn Foss, a Stanford graduate student who is writing a thesis on the role of reflection in the development of metacognitive skill and impasse-driven learning). Finally, students can examine their own floundering in order to formulate self-monitoring strategies that would help to detect and prune non-productive approaches to similar problems.

Geometry Tutor (Anderson, Boyle, & Reiser, 1985). In another learning environment involving reflection, this one for learning the skill of doing proofs in geometry, students are given a diagram of the problem at the top left of the screen and a set of "givens" at the bottom of the screen (see Figure 2). In this example, the goal is to prove the statement at the top of the screen. Students can work either forward from the givens (forward chaining) or backward from what is to be proved (backward chaining) as shown in the middle panel of the figure. The system alternates operators and states in the diagram it constructs. Again as seen in the bottom panel there is a trace of the problem solving process. Although it is impossible to tell the order of the steps taken, the student can see dead ends and look for other possible proofs.

As Anderson, Boyle, Farrell, and Reiser (1984) point out, geometry proofs are usually presented in a fundamentally misleading way. Proofs on paper appear to be linear structures that start from a set of givens and proceed step by step (with a justification for each step) to the statement to be proved. But this is not at all how proofs are constructed by mathematicians or by anybody else. The process of constructing proofs involves an interplay between forward chaining from the givens and backward chaining from the goal statement. Yet, the use of paper and its




Fig. 2 (a) The Geometry Tutor's initial representation of the problem, (b) a representation in the middle of the problem, and (c) a representation at the solution of the problem.

properties encourage students to write proofs as if they were produced only by forward chaining--starting with the givens at the top of the page and working downward to the goal in a two column linear format (left column for the derived statements, right column for the logical justifications). If students infer that they should *construct* proofs this way, they will fail at any long proof. Properly designed computational learning environments can encourage students to proceed in both directions, moving forward, exploring the givens, and moving backwards, finding bridges to the goals.

The representations in Algebraland and Geometry Tutor are abstractions of the problem solving process in terms of "problem spaces". Both systems show the states in the problem space that the student reached and the operators used to reach each of those states. Simply seeing the steps toward a solution reified in this way helps to create a problem space as a mental entity in its own right. This, in turn, makes it possible, for both teachers and students, to characterize problem-solving strategies in terms of abstractions that *refer* to properties concretely manifested in the reified problem space. For example, in geometry it is a good strategy to forward chain at the beginning of a problem in order to understand the implications of the givens. Similarly, if you are stuck in backward chaining, and do not see a way to connect your backward chain to any of the givens, then either go back to forward chaining or go back to the goal state again and try backward chaining along a different path.

These problem solving strategies are what are known as "metacognitive" strategies (Flavell, 1976, Brown, 1978). students must learn them if they are to control their problem solving processes. Metacognitive strategies are what people use to detect and control "floundering", i.e. moving through the problem space without getting closer to the goal. Figure 3 shows the problem space of one of Foss's subjects floundering while using Algebraland. The problem was to solve the equation for V. When the student first got to the state $1/V=1/F-1/U$, he tried a whole series of different operations (e.g., multiplying by 1, dividing by 1, subtracting 1, etc.). In that sequence he even tried the operation that eventually led to success (i.e., multiplying by V), but he failed to see that this step was a good one. The student was obviously floundering at the time, he was just trying operations without any clear plan and without considering where they might lead. As a result he was carrying out operations without apparently getting closer to the goal. Suddenly however, he




Fig. 3 AlgebraLand reflection window showing the trace of an actual student working on the problem at the top of the screen to solve for V.

started over and solved the problem systematically as seen in the window on the right hand side of the screen image.

Anderson, Boyle, Farrell, and Reiser (1984) argue that the system should prevent students from going off the optimal solution path so that they never flounder. They argue that floundering leads to confusion, waste of valuable time, and loss of motivation. In contrast we argue that unless students flounder they won't ever have the opportunity to learn the kinds of metacognitive strategies suggested above. We need to create environments where students can flounder and where the system helps them profit from this floundering by making it explicit and, if need be, by having coaching systems highlight the floundering and help them discover or understand better metacognitive strategies grounded on their particular experience.

Perhaps a mixed pedagogical strategy would be ideal. When students are learning the use and meaning of basic domain operators for moving through a problem space, the system should prevent students from floundering. In this way, their time is being solely focused on mastering the basic tools of the trade. As students begin to tackle real problems, they need the elbow room to explore nooks and crannies of the problem space in order to gain insights into what makes a theorem true or a problem solvable. But during this phase, the system should attempt to provide students guidance on how to examine their own floundering, helping them to detect inherently useless exploration. In this way learning moves naturally from domain skills to metacognitive strategies.

Reflection on the Process of Writing

We can illustrate the educational potential of reflection on the writing process in the context of the NoteCards system developed by Frank Halasz and Tom Moran (Brown, 1985). The NoteCards system is a multi-windowed authoring system based on the metaphor of the small notecards that writers sometimes use to capture, organize, and reorganize their thoughts. NoteCards allows a writer to create notes including text and sketches on a topic they plan to write about. These notes can be indexed however the writer wants by "filing" them in "fileboxes" by source, topic, etc. The writer can also create labeled links between notes that characterize the relationships

between the ideas e.g., comments, contradictions, elaborations, and so forth. The notes and their linkages to fileboxes or other notecards can be viewed in a link-icon browser, exemplified in Figure 4, using link-type selection as a mechanism for filtering the information in the notefile. Thus one might want to see only the cards that deal with the main thesis of the paper. Or one might want to view all the contradictions and support links for a given piece of text. The writer can also create an outline structure of the text and insert links to notes into it. Link icons that represent notecards can be moved freely around in the browser or in an outline allowing either local or global restructuring of the ideas for the paper.

While the initial NoteCards system was under development a history graduate student used the system to write a paper on the deployment of NATO missiles in Western Europe. He read a number of documents and made notes on them in the system. After he had written about thirty notes and filed them in a topic hierarchy, he created a browser which reflected the structure of his initial thinking (see Figure 4). As he created more notes he changed the structure of the browser several different times. When he had written about 500 notes, he decided he was ready to start writing. He created a text outline for the paper and inserted footnote links to particular notes. He then rewrote each note, inserting it as text into the outline, adding bridging sentences and paragraphs as necessary. As he worked, he added new topics and subtopics to his outline. He proceeded in this way until he produced a complete draft.

It is now possible to look at the various structures he created while organizing and writing the paper (i.e. the notes, the various browsers, the outline). By adding a tracing program to the system, it would be possible to replay the actual process by which the paper was constructed, reflecting his strategies for producing a complex text based on many different sources.

People's strategies for writing vary widely. Some writers start with an outline and then produce notes or text to fill out the outline. Bereiter and Scardamalia (1985) argue that children tend to use a "knowledge telling" strategy, in which they write the first thing they think of as the first sentence of a text, then the second thing they think of, and so on. More experienced writers tend to separate idea generation (e.g. producing notes) from actually writing text (Flower & Hayes, 1980), as




Fig. 4 Screen from Notecards showing one of the browsers created by a graduate student working with the system.

did the graduate student in the study. While no one strategy is "correct", some are decidedly more effective than others.

The capability to record and replay the various notes, outlines, and pieces of text that students produce provides a new way for students to think about the process of writing. They might be able to look at the process by which different people produced articles in similar genres. Perhaps students might have access to models of how some classic texts of the future (i.e., by a future Shakespeare or Marx) were constructed using a system like NoteCards. Students could then systematically compare their writing process to a variety of different writers.

This possibility raises the issue of separating out for replay the critical aspects of the writing process. Students are not likely to spend the time to replay the entire process by which a text was produced, unless it is a short text. Instead they will want to see an abstracted replay or reification that highlights parts of the process.

The right set of abstractions (like the problem space abstraction in mathematical problem solving) is needed to characterize the writing process.¹ Then students could observe and analyze abstracted replays of the writing process as practiced by themselves, other students, and more expert writers. An abstracted replay might use notes, outlines, browsers, and paragraph headings as elements in conjunction with operators such as rearrangement, deletion, and annotation as the level of process representation that students observe.

Reflection on the Process of Reading

Reading is a very difficult task in which to apply reflection, because the process goes by very quickly. In spite of this, we would like to sketch the design of a system to tutor reading in which the kind of reflection we have described might be embedded, in order to show the range and power of this technique.

¹Actually there are two kinds of abstractions that need to be considered: the first concerns how to structure and present the problem solving audit trail, the second concerns choosing the right grain size of events that are to be stored on the audit trail so that, metaphorically, the wheat can be easily separated from the chaff. In Algebraland, this latter issue is solved by choosing a set of moderately high level algebraic operators for the student to use in transforming mathematical expressions and to have all the arithmetic simplifications done by just one operator.

Researchers have proposed a number of methods for teaching reading that employ expert modelling as a component (Bereiter and Bird, 1985; Collins and Smith, 1982; Palincsar and Brown, 1984). Collins and Smith, for example, proposed that the teacher read aloud for the student in one voice while verbalizing her own thoughts about the passage in another voice. This technique results in something like a slow motion movie of the reading comprehension process. The teacher verbalizes many different kinds of thoughts: confusions over particular phrases, hypotheses about what a passage means, predictions about what will come later, summaries of what the text says, descriptions of ideas provoked by the text, guesses about the author's intentions, evaluations of the writing, and reevaluations of any of the above as they occur. In short, the goal of expert modelling in this proposal is to verbalize all the thoughts a skilled reader might have while reading.

There have also been several attempts in recent years to build computer-based systems that help people to learn to read (Collins, 1985). One class of systems provides interactive help to novice readers as they read texts, for example, systems that will pronounce any word or sentence that the reader indicates by pointing to it on the screen. We imagine extending systems like this so that the student tries to read the passage aloud. His reading is tape recorded and can be played back at any time. In addition the student would have access to tapes of well known people with different accents and backgrounds (e.g., Vanessa Redgrave, Martin Luther King, and Ricardo Montalban). Thus students can compare how they read the passage to how more expert readers read the passage. Such a system might also ask questions at critical junctures in the student's reading to see what hypotheses, evaluations, and so on he had formed as an active problem-solver trying to comprehend the passage.

In the Stone Soup fable by Aesop shown in Figure 5, we have indicated questions that might be interjected while the student reads, as well as answers an expert might give to each question. In our proposed design, the system would verbally ask the reader each question when they had finished reading the prior sentence. The answer would be recorded. The student then could ask to hear answers to the same question by the same experts who were recorded reading the passage. At any time students could go back and replay either their own tapes or the expert tapes, and even rerecord themselves for a second try.

Figure 5

Stone Soup

A poor man came to a large house during a storm to beg for food. He was sent away with angry words. (Q. Who do you think sent him away and why? A. The owner because he didn't care about beggars.) But he went back and asked, "May I at least dry my clothes by the fire, because I am wet from the rain?" The maid thought this would not cost anything, so she let him come in. (Q. Now who do you think sent him away at first and why? A. The maid, because she didn't want to give away her master's property.) (Q. What do you think will happen when he gets inside? A. He will dry his clothes and maybe make friends with the maid.)

Inside he told the cook that if she would give him a pan, and let him fill it with water, he would make some stone soup. This was a new dish to the cook, so she agreed to let him make it. The man got a stone from the road and put it in the pan. (Q. What good is a stone for making soup? A. It is of no use.) The cook gave him some salt, peas, mint, and all the scraps of meat she could spare to throw in. (Q. Why do you think he offered to make stone soup? A. So he could get to eat all the scraps the cook threw in.) Thus, the poor man made a delicious stone soup and the cook said, "Well done! You have made a wonderful soup out of practically nothing." (Q. Why do you think that the man asked to dry himself inside? A. So he could get inside in order to fool the cook into giving him food.)

Fig. 5 Stone Soup by Aesop with inserted questions and expert answers.

One of the goals in this system design is to make direct comparison possible between what the student and the expert produce in the same situation. Thus the student sees how an expert deals with the same problem he has just tried to solve. Brown and Palincsar (1985) argue that this is one of the critical reasons for the success of the Reciprocal Teaching Method. In Reciprocal Teaching the expert modelling is initiated when the student has difficulties producing a question or a summary for a text, and the teacher intervenes to help provide one. Initially, the teacher, as expert, provides a complete model of how to do the task and gradually turns over more and more of the task to the student, aiding him with leading questions, evaluation of the student's efforts, and encouragement. We do not have the technological capability to do the kind of individual shaping that teachers do in Reciprocal Teaching, but technology can provide expert models to students struggling with problems of pronunciation or interpretation of text.

Conclusion

The recording and replaying of the processes people use to perform tasks such as reading, writing, and problem solving, has the capability to make these processes objects of reflection, annotation, and communication. Using imitation, replay, abstracted replay, and reification, student's can begin to think about, talk about, and experiment with their learning and problem-solving processes in a way not previously possible.

By way of summary, we can briefly reiterate some of the reasons why reflection is important to learning.

1. Students can compare their own process to the way more expert performers carry out the process.
2. With reification, it is possible to reconfigure a process representation so that students can see separate aspects of the process together and can view the process itself from perspectives they have not seen before.
3. Students can derive abstractions about the process by comparing multiple performances simultaneously.
4. Abstractions can be constructed in a form that is critical to developing good metacognitive strategies.

When we design learning environments for any subject, be it history, language, or physics, we should consider how to record and abstract the problem-solving processes students use in these learning environments. We should then provide students with facilities for replaying and observing their own performance and the performance of other students. And finally we should provide process models of more advanced performance that students can compare to their own process.

Acknowledgements

This research was supported by the National Institute of Education under Contract No. US-NIE-C-400-81-0030 and by the Office of Naval Research under Contract No. N00014-C-85-0026.

References

- Anderson, J.R., Boyle, C.F., & Reiser, B.J. (1985) Intelligent tutoring systems. Science, 228, 456-468.
- Anderson, J.R.; Boyle, C.F.; Farrell, R., & Reiser, B.J. (1984) Cognitive principles in the design of computer tutors. In Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Conference of the Cognitive Science Society (pp. 2-9) Boulder, CO: University of Colorado.
- Bereiter, C. & Bird, M. (1985) Use of thinking aloud in identification and teaching of reading comprehension strategies. Cognition & Instruction, 2.
- Bereiter, C. & Scardamalia, M. (1985) Cognitive coping strategies and the problem of "inert knowledge". In S.F. Chipman, J.W. Segal, & R. Glaser (Eds.) Thinking and Learning skills (Vol. 2). Hillsdale, N.J.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Brown, A.L. (1978) Knowing when, where, and how to remember: A problem of metacognition. In R. Glaser (Ed.), Advances in instructional psychology (Vol. 1). Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Brown, J.S. (1985) Process versus product: A perspective on tools for communal and informal electronic learning. Journal of Educational Computing Research, 1, 179-201.
- Bundy, A. (1983) The computer modelling of mathematical reasoning. London, UK: Academic Press.
- Collins, A. (1985) Teaching reading and writing with personal computers. In J. Oransanu (Ed.), A decade of reading research. Implications for practice. Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum.
- Collins, A. and Smith, E.E. (1982) Teaching the process of reading comprehension. In

D.K. Detterman & R.J. Sternberg (Eds.), How much and how can intelligence be increased (pp. 173-185)? Norwood, N.J.: Ablex.

Flavell, J.H. (1978) Metacognitive development. In J.M. Scandura & C.J. Brainerd (Eds.), Structural/process theories of complex human behavior. Alphen a.d. Rijn, the Netherlands. Sijthoff and Nordhoff.

Flower, L.S. & Hayes, J.R. (1980) The dynamics of composing: Making plans and juggling constraints. In L.W. Gregg & E.R. Steinberg (Eds.) Cognitive processes in writing. Hillsdale, NJ. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Palincsar, A.S. & Brown, A.L. (1984). Reciprocal teaching of comprehension-fostering and monitoring activities. Cognition and Instruction, 1, 117-175.

Papert, S. (1980) Mindstorms. New York, NY. Basic Books.

Dr. Phillip L. Ackerman
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Beth Adelson
Department of Computer Science
Tufts University
Medford, MA 02155

Dr. Robert Ahlers
Code N711
Human Factors Laboratory
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Ed Aiken
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Robert Aiken
Temple University
School of Business Administration
Department of Computer and
Information Sciences
Philadelphia, PA 19122

Dr. James Algina
University of Florida
Gainesville, FL 32605

Dr. John Allen
Department of Psychology
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. William E. Alley
AFHRL/MOT
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. John R. Anderson
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Thomas H. Anderson
Center for the Study of Reading
174 Children's Research Center
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Dr. Steve Andriole
George Mason University
School of Information
Technology & Engineering
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Technical Director, ARI
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Alan Baddeley
Medical Research Council
Applied Psychology Unit
15 Chaucer Road
Cambridge CB2 2EF
ENGLAND

Dr. Patricia Baggett
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Box 345
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Eva L. Baker
UCLA Center for the Study
of Evaluation
145 Moore Hall
University of California
Los Angeles, CA 90024

Dr. Meryl S. Baker
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Isaac Bejar
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08450

Leo Beltracchi
United States Nuclear
Regulatory Commission
Washington DC 20555

Dr. Mark H. Bickhard
University of Texas
EDB 504 ED Psych
Austin, TX 78712

Dr. John Black
Teachers College
Columbia University
525 West 121st Street
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Arthur S. Blaiwes
Code N711
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Robert Blanchard
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. R. Darrell Bock
University of Chicago
NORC
6030 South Ellis
Chicago, IL 60637

Dr. Jeff Bonar
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Richard Braby
NTSC Code 10
Orlando, FL 32751

Dr. Jomillis H. Braddock II
Center for the Social
Organization of Schools
The Johns Hopkins University
3505 North Charles Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. Robert Breaux
Code N-095R
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Ann Brown
Center for the Study of Reading
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Commanding Officer
CAPT Lorin W. Brown
NROTC Unit
Illinois Institute of Technology
3300 S. Federal Street
Chicago, IL 60616-3793

Dr. John S. Brown
XEROX Palo Alto Research
Center
3333 Coyote Road
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. John Bruer
The James S. McDonnell
Foundation
University Club Tower, Suite 1610
1034 South Brentwood Blvd.
St. Louis, MO 63117

Dr. Bruce Buchanan
Computer Science Department
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Patricia A. Butler
OERI
555 New Jersey Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Tom Cafferty
Dept. of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Joseph C. Campione
Center for the Study of Reading
University of Illinois
51 Gerty Drive
Champaign, IL 61820

Joanne Capper
Center for Research into Practice
1718 Connecticut Ave. N.W.
Washington, DC 20009

Dr. Susan Carey
Harvard Graduate School of
Education
337 Gutman Library
Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Pat Carpenter
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. John M. Carroll
IBM Watson Research Center
User Interface Institute
P.O. Box 218
Yorktown Heights, NY 10598

LCDR Robert Carter
Office of the Chief
of Naval Operations
OP-01B
Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Dr. Alphonse Chapanis
8415 Bellona Lane
Suite 210
Buxton Towers
Baltimore, MD 21204

Dr. Davida Charney
English Department
Penn State University
University Park, PA 16802

Dr. Paul R. Chatelier
OUSDRE
Pentagon
Washington, DC 20350-2000

Dr. Michelene Chi
Learning R & D Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. L. J. Chmura
Computer Science and Systems
Code 7590
Information Technology Division
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375

Mr. Raymond E. Christal
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. William Clancey
Stanford University
Knowledge Systems Laboratory
701 Welch Road, Bldg C
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. Charles Clifton
Tobin Hall
Department of Psychology
University of
Massachusetts
Amherst, MA 01003

Dr. Allan M. Collins
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Stanley Collyer
Office of Naval Technology
Code 222
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Dr. Lynn A. Cooper
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

LT Judy Crookshanks
Chief of Naval Operations
OP-112G5
Washington, DC 20370-2000

Phil Cunniff
Commanding Officer, Code 7500
Naval Undersea Warfare Engineering
Keyport, WA 98345

Dr. Cary Czichon
Intelligent Instructional Systems
Texas Instruments AI Lab
P O Box 660245
Dallas, TX 75266

Brian Dallman
3400 TTW/TTGXS
Lowry AFB, CO 80230-5000

Dr. Natalie Dehn
Department of Computer and
Information Science
University of Oregon
Eugene, OR 97403

Dr. Gerald F. DeJong
Artificial Intelligence Group
Coordinated Science Laboratory
University of Illinois
Urbana, IL 61801

Goery Delacote
Directeur de L'informatique
Scientifique et Technique
CNRS
15, Quai Anatole France
75700 Paris FRANCE

Dr. Thomas E. DeZern
Project Engineer, AI
General Dynamics
PO Box 748
Fort Worth, TX 76101

Dr. Andrea di Sessa
University of California
School of Education
Tolman Hall
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. R. K. Dismukes
Associate Director for Life Sciences
AFOSR
Bolling AFB
Washington, DC 20332

Dr. Stephanie Doan
Code 6021
Naval Air Development Center
Warminster, PA 18974-5000

Defense Technical
Information Center
Cameron Station, Bldg 5
Alexandria, VA 22314
Attn TC
(12 Copies)

Dr. Thomas M. Duffy
Communications Design Center
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Richard Duran
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Edward E. Eddowes
CNATRA N301
Naval Air Station
Corpus Christi, TX 78419

Dr. John Ellis
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92252

Dr. Jeffrey Elman
University of California,
San Diego
Department of Linguistics, C-008
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Susan Embretson
University of Kansas
Psychology Department
426 Fraser
Lawrence, KS 66045

Dr. Randy Engle
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. William Epstein
University of Wisconsin
W. J. Brogden Psychology Bldg
1202 W. Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706

ERIC Facility-Acquisitions
4833 Rugby Avenue
Bethesda, MD 20014

Dr. K. Anders Ericsson
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Beatrice J. Farr
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Marshall J. Farr
Farr-Sight Co.
2520 North Vernon Street
Arlington, VA 22207

Dr. Paul Feltovich
Southern Illinois University
School of Medicine
Medical Education Department
P O. Box 3926
Springfield, IL 62708

Mr. Wallace Feurzeig
Educational Technology
Bolt Beranek & Newman
10 Moulton St.
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Gerhard Fischer
University of Colorado
Department of Computer Science
Boulder, CO 80309

J. D. Fletcher
9931 Corsica Street
Vienna VA 22180

Dr. Linda Flower
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of English
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Kenneth D. Forbus
University of Illinois
Department of Computer Science
1304 West Springfield Avenue
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Barbara A. Fox
University of Colorado
Department of Linguistics
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Carl H. Frederiksen
McGill University
3700 McTavish Street
Montreal, Quebec H3A 1Y2
CANADA

Dr. John R. Frederiksen
Bolt Beranek & Newman
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Michael Genesereth
Stanford University
Computer Science Department
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Dedre Gentner
University of Illinois
Department of Psychology
603 E. Daniel St
Champaign, IL 61820

Lee Gladwin
Route 3 -- Box 225
Winchester, VA 22601

Dr. Robert Glaser
Learning Research
& Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Arthur M. Glenberg
University of Wisconsin
W. J. Brogden Psychology Bldg
1202 W. Johnson Street
Madison, WI 53706

Dr. Marvin D. Glock
13 Stone Hall
Cornell University
Ithaca, NY 14853

Dr. Sam Glucksberg
Department of Psychology
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. Joseph Goguen
Computer Science Laboratory
SRI International
333 Ravenswood Avenue
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Dr. Susan Goldman
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Daniel Gopher
Industrial Engineering
& Management
TECHNION
Haifa 32000
ISRAEL

Dr. Sherrie Gott
AFHRL/MODJ
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Jordan Grafman, Ph.D.
2021 Lyttonsville Road
Silver Spring, MD 20910

Dr. Wayne Gray
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Bert Green
Johns Hopkins University
Department of Psychology
Charles & 34th Street
Baltimore, MD 21218

Dr. James G. Greeno
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Prof. Edward Haertel
School of Education
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Henry M. Halff
Halff Resources, Inc.
4918 33rd Road, North
Arlington, VA 22207

Janice Hart
Office of the Chief
of Naval Operations
OP-11HD
Department of the Navy
Washington, D.C. 20350-2000

Mr. William Hartung
PEAM Product Manager
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Wayne Harvey
Center for Learning Technology
Educational Development Center
55 Chapel Street
Newton, MA 02160

Prof. John R. Hayes
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Barbara Hayes-Roth
Department of Computer Science
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 95305

Dr. Joan I. Heller
505 Haddon Road
Oakland, CA 94606

Dr. Shelly Heller
Department of Electrical Engi-
neering & Computer Science
George Washington University
Washington, DC 20052

Dr. Jim Hollan
Intelligent Systems Group
Institute for
Cognitive Science (C-015)
UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Melissa Holland
Army Research Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Ms. Julia S. Hough
Lawrence Erlbaum Associates
6012 Greene Street
Philadelphia, PA 19144

Dr. James Howard
Dept. of Psychology
Human Performance Laboratory
Catholic University of
America
Washington, DC 20064

Dr. Earl Hunt
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, WA 98105

Dr. Ed Hutchins
Intelligent Systems Group
Institute for
Cognitive Science (C-015)
UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Dillon Inouye
WICAT Education Institute
Provo, UT 84057

Dr. Alice Isen
Department of Psychology
University of Maryland
Catonsville, MD 21228

Dr. R. J. K. Jacob
Computer Science and Systems
Code: 7590
Information Technology Division
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375

Dr. Zachary Jacobson
Bureau of Management Consulting
365 Laurier Avenue West
Ottawa, Ontario K1A 0S5
CANADA

Dr. Robert Jannarone
Department of Psychology
University of South Carolina
Columbia, SC 29208

Dr. Claude Janvier
Directeur, CIRADE
Universite du Quebec a Montreal
P.O. Box 8888, St. "A"
Montreal, Quebec H3C 3P8
CANADA

Dr. Robin Jeffries
Hewlett-Packard Laboratories
P.O. Box 10490
Palo Alto, CA 94303-0971

Margaret Jerome
c/o Dr. Peter Chandler
83, The Drive
Hove
Sussex
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Douglas H. Jones
Thatcher Jones Associates
P.O. Box 6640
10 Trafalgar Court
Lawrenceville, NJ 08648

Dr. Marcel Just
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Ruth Kanfer
University of Minnesota
Department of Psychology
Elliott Hall
75 E. River Road
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. Milton S. Katz
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Dennis Kibler
University of California
Department of Information
and Computer Science
Irvine, CA 92717

Dr. David Kieras
University of Michigan
Technical Communication
College of Engineering
1223 E. Engineering Building
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Peter Kincaid
Training Analysis
& Evaluation Group
Department of the Navy
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Paula Kirk
Oakridge Associated Universities
University Programs Division
P.O. Box 117
Oakridge, TN 37831-0117

Dr. David Klahr
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Stephen Kosslyn
Harvard University
1236 William James Hall
33 Kirkland St.
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Kenneth Kotovsky
Department of Psychology
Community College of
Allegheny County
800 Allegheny Avenue
Pittsburgh, PA 15233

Dr. Benjamin Kuipers
University of Texas at Austin
Department of Computer Sciences
T.S. Painter Hall 3.28
Austin, TX 78712

Dr. Pat Langley
University of California
Department of Information
and Computer Science
Irvine, CA 92717

M. Diane Langston
Communications Design Center
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Jill Larkin
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. R. W. Lawler
ARI 6 S 10
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333-5600

Dr. Alan M. Lesgold
Learning Research and
Development Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Jim Levin
Department of
Educational Psychology
210 Education Building
1310 South Sixth Street
Champaign, IL 61820-6990

Dr. John Levine
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Clayton Lewis
University of Colorado
Department of Computer Science
Campus Box 430
Boulder, CO 80309

Library
Naval War College
Newport, RI 02940

Library
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813

Dr. Charlotte Linde
Structural Semantics
P O Box 707
Palo Alto, CA 94320

Dr. Marcia C. Linn
Lawrence Hall of Science
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Frederic M. Lord
Educational Testing Service
Princeton, NJ 08541

Dr. Sandra P. Marshall
Dept. of Psychology
San Diego State University
San Diego, CA 92182

Dr. Richard E. Mayer
Department of Psychology
University of California
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Jay McClelland
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Joe McLachlan
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. James S. McMichael
Navy Personnel Research
and Development Center
Code 05
San Diego, CA 92152

Dr. Barbara Means
Human Resources
Research Organization
1100 South Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Arthur Melmed
U. S. Department of Education
724 Brown
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. George A. Miller
Department of Psychology
Green Hall
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540

Dr. James R. Miller
MCC
9430 Research Blvd.
Echelon Building #1, Suite 231
Austin, TX 78759

Dr. Mark Miller
Computer Thought Corporation
1721 West Plano Parkway
Plano, TX 75075

Dr. Andrew R. Molnar
Scientific and Engineering
Personnel and Education
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. William Montague
NPRDC Code 13
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Randy Mumaw
Program Manager
Training Research Division
HumRRO
1100 S. Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Allen Munro
Behavioral Technology
Laboratories - USC
1845 S. Elena Ave., 4th Floor
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dr. T. Niblett
The Turing Institute
36 North Hanover Street
Glasgow G1 2AD, Scotland
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Richard E. Nisbett
University of Michigan
Institute for Social Research
Room 5261
Ann Arbor, MI 48109

Dr. Mary Jo Nissen
University of Minnesota
N218 Elliott Hall
Minneapolis, MN 55455

Dr. A. F. Norcio
Computer Science and Systems
Code 7590
Information Technology Division
Naval Research Laboratory
Washington, DC 20375

Dr. Donald A. Norman
Institute for Cognitive
Science C-015
University of California, San Diego
La Jolla, California 92093

Director, Training Laboratory
NPRDC (Code 05)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Director, Manpower and Personnel
Laboratory,
NPRDC (Code 06)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Director, Human Factors
& Organizational Systems Lab,
NPRDC (Code 07)
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Library, NPRDC
Code P201L
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Technical Director
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Harold F. O'Neill, Jr.
School of Education - WPH 801
Department of Educational
Psychology & Technology
University of Southern California
Los Angeles, CA 90089-0031

Dr. Michael Oberlin
Naval Training Systems Center
Code 711
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Stellan Ohlsson
Learning R & D Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Director, Research Programs,
Office of Naval Research
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Research,
Code 1133
800 N Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Research,
Code 1142PS
800 N Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Research,
Code 1142CS
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000
(6 Copies)

Office of Naval Research,
Code 11R
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Director, Technology Programs,
Office of Naval Research
Code 12
800 North Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Office of Naval Research,
Code 125
800 N. Quincy Street
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research
Branch Office, London
Box 39
FPO New York NY 09510

Special Assistant for Marine
Corps Matters,
ONR Code 00MC
800 N Quincy St
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

Psychologist
Office of Naval Research
Liaison Office, Far East
APO San Francisco, CA 96503

Office of Naval Research,
Resident Representative,
UCSD
University of California,
San Diego
La Jolla, CA 92093-0001

Assistant for Planning MANTRAPERS
OP 01B6
Washington, DC 20370

Assistant for MPT Research.
Development and Studies
OP 01B7
Washington, DC 20370

Dr. Judith Orasanu
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

CDR R. T. Parlette
Chief of Naval Operations
OP-112G
Washington, DC 20370-2000

Dr. James Paulson
Department of Psychology
Portland State University
P. O. Box 751
Portland, OR 97207

Dr. Douglas Pearse
DCIEM
Box 2000
Downsview, Ontario
CANADA

Dr. James W. Pellegrino
University of California,
Santa Barbara
Department of Psychology
Santa Barbara, CA 93106

Dr. Virginia E. Pendergrass
Code 711
Naval Training Systems Center
Orlando, FL 32813-7100

Dr. Nancy Pennington
University of Chicago
Graduate School of Business
1101 E. 58th St
Chicago, IL 60637

Military Assistant for Training and
Personnel Technology
OUSD (R & E)
Room 3D129, The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20301-3080

Dr. Ray Perez
ARI (PERI-II)
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. David N. Perkins
Educational Technology Center
337 Gutman Library
Appian Way
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Steven Pinker
Department of Psychology
E10-018
M.I.T.
Cambridge, MA 02139

Dr. Tjeerd Plomp
Twente University of Technology
Department of Education
P.O. Box 217
7500 AE ENSCHEDE
THE NETHERLANDS

Dr. Martha Polson
Department of Psychology
Campus Box 346
University of Colorado
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Peter Polson
University of Colorado
Department of Psychology
Boulder, CO 80309

Dr. Michael I. Posner
Department of Neurology
Washington University
Medical School
St. Louis, MO 63110

Dr. Joseph Psotka
ATTN: PERI-1C
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Mark D. Reckase
ACT
P. O. Box 168
Iowa City, IA 52243

Dr. Lynne Reder
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Wesley Regian
AFHRL/MOD
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Fred Reif
Physics Department
University of California
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Lauren Resnick
Learning R & D Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Gil Ricard
Mail Stop C04-14
Grumman Aerospace Corp.
Bethpage, NY 11714

Mark Richer
1041 Lake Street
San Francisco, CA 94118

Dr. Linda G. Roberts
Science, Education, and
Transportation Program
Office of Technology Assessment
Congress of the United States
Washington, DC 20510

Dr. Andrew M. Rose
American Institutes
for Research
1055 Thomas Jefferson St. NW
Washington, DC 20007

Dr. David Rumlhart
Center for Human
Information Processing
Univ. of California
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. James F. Sanford
Department of Psychology
George Mason University
4400 University Drive
Fairfax, VA 22030

Dr. Walter Schneider
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
3939 O'Hara Street
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Dr. Alan H. Schoenfeld
University of California
Department of Education
Berkeley, CA 94720

Dr. Janet Schofield
Learning R&D Center
University of Pittsburgh
Pittsburgh, PA 15260

Karen A. Schriver
Department of English
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Marc Sebrechts
Department of Psychology
Wesleyan University
Middletown, CT 06475

Dr. Judith Segal
OERI
555 New Jersey Ave. NW
Washington, DC 20208

Dr. Colleen M. Seifert
Intelligent Systems Group
Institute for
Cognitive Science (C-015)
UCSD
La Jolla, CA 92093

Dr. Ramsay W. Selden
Assessment Center
CCSSO
Suite 379
400 N. Capitol, NW
Washington, DC 20001

Dr. Sylvia A. S. Shafto
Department of
Computer Science
Towson State University
Towson, MD 21204

Dr. Ben Shneiderman
Dept. of Computer Science
University of Maryland
College Park, MD 20742

Dr. Lee Shulman
Stanford University
1040 Cathcart Way
Stanford, CA 94305

Dr. Randall Shumaker
Naval Research Laboratory
Code 7510
4555 Overlook Avenue, S.W.
Washington, DC 20375-5000

Dr. Valerie Shute
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Robert S. Siegler
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Zita M. Simutis
Instructional Technology
Systems Area
ARI
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Manpower Research
and Advisory Services
Smithsonian Institution
801 North Pitt Street
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Derek Sleeman
Dept. of Computing Science
King's College
Old Aberdeen
AB9 2UB
UNITED KINGDOM

Dr. Richard E. Snow
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, CA 94306

Dr. Elliot Soloway
Yale University
Computer Science Department
P.O. Box 2158
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Kathryn T. Spoehr
Brown University
Department of Psychology
Providence, RI 02912

James J. Staszewski
Research Associate
Carnegie-Mellon University
Department of Psychology
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Robert Sternberg
Department of Psychology
Yale University
Box 11A, Yale Station
New Haven, CT 06520

Dr. Albert Stevens
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
10 Moulton St.
Cambridge, MA 02238

Dr. Paul J. Sticha
Senior Staff Scientist
Training Research Division
HumRRO
1100 S. Washington
Alexandria, VA 22314

Dr. Thomas Sticht
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. John Tangney
AFOSR/NL
Bolling AFB, DC 20332

Dr. Kikumi Tatsuoka
CERL
252 Engineering Research
Laboratory
Urbana, IL 61801

Dr. Robert P. Taylor
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York, NY 10027

Dr. Perry W. Thorndyke
FMC Corporation
Central Engineering Labs
1185 Coleman Avenue, Box 580
Santa Clara, CA 95052

Dr. Sharon Tkacz
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Douglas Towne
Behavioral Technology Labs
1845 S. Elena Ave.
Redondo Beach, CA 90277

Dr. Paul Twohig
Army Research Institute
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Kurt Van Lehn
Department of Psychology
Carnegie-Mellon University
Schenley Park
Pittsburgh, PA 15213

Dr. Jerry Vogt
Navy Personnel R&D Center
Code 51
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Beth Warren
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
50 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02138

Dr. Barbara White
Bolt Beranek & Newman, Inc.
10 Moulton Street
Cambridge, MA 02238

LCDR Cory deGroot Whitehead
Chief of Naval Operations
OP-112G1
Washington, DC 20370-2000

Dr. Heather Wild
Naval Air Development
Center
Code 6021
Warminster, PA 18974-5000

Dr. William Clancey
Stanford University
Knowledge Systems Laboratory
701 Welch Road, Bldg. C
Palo Alto, CA 94304

Dr. Michael Williams
IntelliCorp
1975 El Camino Real West
Mountain View, CA 94040-2216

Dr. Robert A. Wisher
U.S. Army Institute for the
Behavioral and Social Sciences
5001 Eisenhower Avenue
Alexandria, VA 22333

Dr. Martin F. Wiskoff
Navy Personnel R & D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Dan Wolz
AFHRL/MOE
Brooks AFB, TX 78235

Dr. Wallace Wulfeck, III
Navy Personnel R&D Center
San Diego, CA 92152-6800

Dr. Joe Yasatuke
AFHRL/LRT
Lowry AFB, CO 80230

Dr. Joseph L. Young
Memory & Cognitive
Processes
National Science Foundation
Washington, DC 20550

Dr. Steven Zornetzer
Office of Naval Research
Code 114
800 N. Quincy St.
Arlington, VA 22217-5000

END

4-87

DTIC